

REMARKS

Claims 1-70, as amended, remain herein.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 20, 34, 36, 38 and 53 have been amended to recite setting a pixel luminance value to a target luminance setting value at least two times. See applicants' specification, page 38, line 20 to page 39, line 11, describing one renewal of the correction value has been carried out one time, then the correction operation is carried out again. The renewal of correction value is repeated until the deviation between the luminance information and the target value reaches or falls below a fixed value, thereby making it possible to match the target luminance of all of the pixels, thereby ameliorating variation among them. Editorial changes have been made in claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 14, 20, 24-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 38, 40-43, 46, 47, 53-58 and 62.

Serial No.: 10/089,802

1. Claims 1-22, 34-55 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Yamaguchi U.S. Patent 6,621,475.

The presently claimed method and apparatus for driving a display panel include setting a pixel luminance value to a target luminance setting value at least two times. This arrangement and corresponding method for using such arrangement are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Yamaguchi '475, Fig. 1A, as allegedly disclosing driving luminance multiple settings over time, showing a driving voltage used to adjust luminance, and setting the luminance of one device based on that measured from another device. As the Office Action admits, Yamaguchi '475 discloses that the application period of the voltage pulses is divided into three periods. However, during those three periods of application, luminance settings are performed only once. The method of Yamaguchi '475 does not include setting pixel luminance to a target luminance setting value at least two times, as recited in applicants' claims 1, 3, 5, 20, 34, 36, 38 and 53.

Applicants' claim 7 recites a method for driving a display panel including carrying out a series of renewal operations (plural) on the correction memory for all of the pixels at specified time intervals (plural), which necessarily means that the renewal operation is performed at least two times.

For the foregoing reasons, Yamaguchi '475 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Yamaguchi '475 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 2, 4, 9, 16, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1; claims 10-15, 17-19, 21 and 22, which depend from claim 3, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 3; claim 6, which depends from claim 5, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 5; claims 35, 37, 42, 46-52 which depend from claim 34, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 34; claim 39, which depends from claim 38, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for

Serial No.: 10/089,802

claim 38; claims 41, 43-45, which depend from claim 40, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 40; claims 54-70, which depend from claim 36, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 36. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 24-33 and 56-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamaguchi '475 and Howard et al. U.S. Patent 6,023,259. The Office Action cites Howard '259 as allegedly teaching pulse width modulation and amplitude modulation generation of gray scale display.

Claims 24-33 and 56-66 are allowable over Yamaguchi '475 for the reasons explained herein. The Office Action cites Howard '259 as allegedly teaching pulse width modulation and amplitude modulation generation of gray scale display.

However, Howard '259 does not provide the deficiencies of Yamaguchi 475 explained herein, i.e., Howard '259 does not teach setting pixel luminance to a target luminance setting value at least two times, as recited in applicants' independent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Yamaguchi '475 nor Howard '259 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 23 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamaguchi '475 and Xie et al. U.S. Patent 6,025,819.

Claims 23 and 67 are allowable over Yamaguchi '475 for the reasons explained herein. The Office Action cites Xie '819 as allegedly teaching gamma corrections of pixels. However, Xie '819 does not provide the deficiencies of Yamaguchi 475 explained herein, i.e., Xie '819 does not teach setting pixel luminance to a target luminance setting value at least two times, as recited in applicants' claim 3 from which claim 23 depends or in applicants' claim 36 from which claim 67 depends.

Serial No.: 10/089,802

For the foregoing reasons, neither Yamaguchi '475 nor Xie '819 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-70 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-70 is respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/089,802

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

November 3, 2004
Date

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:110

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220